

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application, and claim 1 is independent. Claims 1 and 3 amended. In light of the below remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – JIN in view of YAMAGUCHI**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jin* in view of *Yamaguchi*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the new Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision of *KSR International, Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.* it is stated that the proper analysis for a determination of obviousness is whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art after consideration of all the facts. The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious. An Office Action must explain why the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. See 72 Fed. Reg. 57526, 57528-529 (Oct. 10, 2007).

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Jin and Yamaguchi does not separately or in combination teach or suggest all the limitations set forth in amended claim 1. Further, there has been no explanation made of why the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. For example, independent claim 1 recites a lateral bipolar CMOS integrated circuit including, among other things, a current source “wherein currents from the current source connected with the p-type base terminal of the n-channel MOS transistor and the correct source connected with the n-type base terminal of the p-channel MOS transistor are maintained at about 0 when the input voltage to the

gate input terminal is approximately constant at a high level and constant at a low level.” At best, it may be argued that the current of Yamaguchi is generally maintained at a steady state when voltage is also at a steady state, however, as shown in the FIGS. of Yamaguchi. However, Yamaguchi does not show the current dropping to about 0 when the input voltage to the gate input terminal is approximately constant at a high level and the current dropping to about 0 when the input voltage to the gate input terminal is approximately constant at a low level as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Jin nor Yamaguchi, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations set forth in amended claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 1-4 be removed.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – JIN in view of YAMAGUCHI, SHIMOMURA et al.**

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jin* in view of *Yamaguchi*, and in further view of *Shimomura et al.* (as cited in the Information Disclosure Statement dated September 29, 2005). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 5-8 are dependent upon claim 1 and claim 1 has been shown patentable at least for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, claims 5-8 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. For this reason the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C §103(a) of claims 5-8 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.


Pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the June 4, 2008 Notice of Panel Decision, and submit the required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313 at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,  
HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



DJD/PXL:eab

Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000